

Remarks

Claims 3, 30-33, 62-65, 93-96, and 123-125 are pending in the referenced application by the present amendment. Claims 1-2 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 3, 30-33, 62-65, 93-96, and 123-125 have been amended. However, the amendment of at least claims 3 and 96 merely add antecedent support for the short-hand “PBMC”, and do not narrow the scope of the claims in any regard. Support for additional amendments may be found, *e.g.*, in the original claims and in the specification at pages 1691-1694. . No new matter enters by the foregoing amendments. Entry of the amendment and consideration of the application as amended is therefore respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, Indefiniteness

Claims 1-2, 30-33, 62-65, 93-95, and 123-125 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite.

Claims 1-2 have been rejected due to recitation of the phrase “capable of.” Without agreeing with the rejection, these claims have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. As such, this rejection is now moot.

Claims 30-33, 62-65, 93-95, and 123-125 have been rejected because it is unclear whether the claims are drawn to one specific carboxylic ester hydrolase enzyme or a partially purified fraction of a PBMC extract. While not agreeing with the rejection, the claims have been amended in a manner similar to that suggested by the Examiner so to recite “at least a partially purified fraction of a PBMC extract comprising GS-7340 Ester Hydrolase.” It is submitted that one of skill in the art would understand the metes and bounds of the claims, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, Written Description

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without agreeing with the rejection, the claim has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. As such, this rejection is now moot.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, Enablement

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph because the specification allegedly lacks enablement commensurate in scope with the claim. Without agreeing with the rejection, the claim has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. As such, this rejection is now moot.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and timely allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in resolving any outstanding issues, she is invited to call Applicants' undersigned representative at (303) 863-2303.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 22, 2007

/Milan M. Vnnola/
Milan M. Vinnola (Reg. No. 45,979)
David R. Marsh (Reg. No. 41,408)

ARNOLD & PORTER LLP
Attn: IP Docketing
555 Twelfth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004-1206
202.942.5000 telephone
202.942.5999 facsimile